



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,362	11/27/2000	Timothy Joseph Chainer	YOR919940252US11	6942

7590 11/27/2001

BLANCHE E SCHILLER ESQ
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG P C
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER

SNIEZEK, ANDREW L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2651

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/723,362

Applicant(s)
Chainer et al.

Examiner
Andrew Sniezek

Art Unit
2651



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 27, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-28 and 53-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25, 26, 53, 54, 57, and 60-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 27, 28, 55, 56, 58, and 59 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2651

1. The following action is in response to the amendment filed 8/27/01. The terminal disclaimer filed 8/27/01 is acknowledged.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 25-26, 53, 60-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamakoshi et al.

Yamakoshi et al. teaches detecting systematic errors (elements 13,14) and the correction of these errors by a delay time control arrangement (elements 15, 20, 30). The Examiner has interpreted systematic errors as errors that are dependent on a given variable of the device such as separations between transducers. In Yamakoshi et al. this separation is defined by "L". The limitations of claims 25-26, 53 are satisfied by this teaching. The limitations of claims 60-64 and 66-70 are satisfied by Yamakoshi et al. since as discussed, each track across the disk would have a distinct systematic error. The correction of the systematic errors as taught inherently would correct at least some random errors that occur, therefor satisfying the limitations of claims 65 and 71.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2651

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakoshi et al..

Yamakoshi et al. teaches to compensate for the circumferential displacement between heads while writing information. Claim 57 further sets forth that the data recorded is a servo timing pattern. This exact type of data is not disclosed by Yamakoshi et al., however the type of data being recorded does not change the compensation arrangement as taught by Yamakoshi et al. Writing servo timing patterns are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to extend the teaching of Yamakoshi et al. such that any type of data could have been recorded including that set forth in claim 57 and that this data is written without systematic errors, given the teaching of Yamakoshi et al.

Art Unit: 2651


6. Claims 27-28, 55-56, 58-59 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Sniezek whose telephone and VoiceMail number is (703) 308-1602. If a plurality of attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, D. Hudspeth, can be reached on (703) 308-4825

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization (Group 2650) where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377


Andrew L. Sniezek
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2651

A.L.S.
November 14, 2001